



1 Fw  
DAc

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

To: The Petition Center  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

From: Igor Troitski, first named inventor of applications No. **10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121 and 11/023,115**; examiner: Maria Alexandra Elve  
6971 Dancing Cloud Ave  
Henderson, NV 89011

03/02/2009

This is the petition to qualify the Office Actions produced by Maria Alexandra Elve with respect to applications No: **10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121 and 11/023,115** as unqualified.

I emphasize that it is not petition to revise the decisions of these Office Actions. I only respectfully request to learn the enclosed Remarks to get convinced that these Office Actions do not meet the requirements of qualified Office Actions because:

1. The Office Actions do not contain examination of Claims of presented inventions.
2. The Office Actions contain pages which have been used in previous Office Actions.
3. The Office Actions reject all Claims of presented applications without distinguishing one claim from another even though these claims can relate to different subject matters (for example, several claims relate to creation of laser-induced images, other relate to destruction of object by laser radiation).
4. The Office Actions reject Claims of presented application by referencing to patents, which do not relate to the subject matter of the present applications (for example,

Claims disclosing destruction of object by laser radiation are rejected by referencing to patents disclosing methods for creation of images).

5. The examiner does not know the scientific publications, U.S. Patents and terminology relating to the art of the present invention and does not read presented references.

6. The examiner does not know the breakdown phenomenon, which is the foundation of the inventions disclosed in the above mentioned applications.

7. The Office Action in the response to the Request for Continued Examination does not contain examination of the applicant's arguments stated in the Remarks of the Response and coincide word for word with the previous final Office Action.

8. The Advisory Actions in the response to the Request for Reconsideration completely ignore the applicant's arguments, contain false statement and misrepresent the facts.

I am retired scientist and hold 26 U.S. patents but I am faced with such disgraceful situation for the first time.

Enclosed: Remarks (pages 2- 22)

Sincerely submitted by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Igor Troitski', with a long, sweeping horizontal line above it.

Igor Troitski

## REMARKS

### EVIDENCES FOR CONCLUSION

**that the Office Actions mentioned above are produced by Maria Alexandra Elve by using pages of former Office Actions and without examination of the Claims and descriptions of present applications.**

**I.**     *The non-final Office Action mailed on 01/02/2009 with respect to application No. 11/108,121.*

This application comprises 40 Claims but no one Claim is examined. Detailed Action of this Office Action contains about 40 lines, from which 28 lines (6-12, 14-20, 24-40) describe referenced patents and the rest lines are generally accepted in any Office Action.

**II.**    *The non-final Office Action mailed on 09/05/2008 with respect to application No. 11/317,379.*

1. The Detailed Action of this Office Action contains 6 pages from which 4 pages coincide with identical pages of the Office Action made with respect to applications No. 11/234,813; two pages coincide with pages of the Office Action made with respect to applications No. 11/053,983. All these pages do not relate to the subject matter of the present invention.

2. This Office Action rejects Claims, disclosing the method for the destruction of balloons, on the base of patents, which do not relate to the destruction, but relate to the creation of images.

3. Fifteen Claims from nineteen Claims of this application disclose the method for destruction of balloons by laser radiation but this Office Action does not even contain key words of this invention (“destruction”, “destroy”) or their synonyms.

4. This Office Action does not examine a Claim and rejects all 19 Claims without distinguishing one from another even though some claims relate to the creation of images while others relate to the destruction of balloons by laser radiation (“Claims 1-19 are rejected ...” page 2 lines 3, 8; page3 lines 1, 11; page 4, line 4; page 6, line 15).

5. The present invention does not use holographic method and even does not contain words “holography” or “holographic”, but the examiner rejects all presented Claims referencing to “a laser light show device, which uses the holography generating capability of laser light to produce projected images having enhanced holographic effects” (page 4). It is nonsense to reject Claims disclosing the destruction of objects by referencing to holography!

6. A method of the present invention does not use combination of red, blue and green lasers (and even does not contains words “red, blue and green”) but this Office Action rejects all Claims (including Claims disclosing destruction of balloons) by referencing to the fact that “red, blue and green lasers may be used and in combination may provide a monochromatic coherent collimated laser beam” (pages 5-6)).

7. The examiner rejects all claims, including claims disclosing the destruction, by making reference to the following: “A perpendicular incident beam passes through the layers of the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index (i.e. at each surface of each transparent layer where there is a gas to transparent medium (e.g. glass to air) transition.” However, the invention does not use “the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index” and the application does not even contain words “the transparent multi-planar optical element” and “refractive index”.

8. The present invention does not use the secondary emission effect and even does not contain words “secondary emission” or “emission”, but the examiner rejects all Claims by referencing to the fact that “the modulated beam need not be of a visible light

wavelength, since it is only necessary that secondary emissions from the imaging gas provide visible light” (page 5).

9. The present invention does not use a “rotating viewing surface” and does not even contain such words, but the examiner rejects all Claims by referencing to the fact that “the laser beam is directed at a rotating viewing surface, the viewing of the surface being semi-transparent...” (page 6).

10. This Office Action falsely states that the application contains terms which are not really used in this application (for example, “laser-induced breakdown” or “threshold breakdown”, page 2). This false statement is used for rejection of all claims.

### **III.    *The Final Office Action mailed on 12/29/2008 with respect to the application No. 11/317,379***

1. The Detailed Action of this Office Action contains 6 pages from which four pages coincide with identical pages of the Office Action made with respect to applications No. 11/234,813; two pages coincide with pages of the Office Action made with respect to applications No. 11/053,983. All these pages do not relate to the subject matter of the present invention.

2. This Office Action does not respond to arguments, which were stated in Response mailed on 09.18.2008. The Detailed Action of the Final Office Action does not almost differ from the Detailed Action of the non-final Office Action. It contains 6 ½ pages which word for word (with the exception of 15 lines) coincides with the Detailed Action of the non-final Office Action. In particular, the Final Office Action does not explain:

- why the non-final Office Action contains false statement that the present application uses terms which this application does not contain;

- why the non-final Office Action does not examine a Claim and rejects all 19 Claims without distinguishing one from another even though some claims relate to the creation of images while others relate to the destruction of balloons by laser radiation;
  - why the non-final Office Action rejects Claims disclosing method for destruction of balloons by referencing to the U.S. patents which do not relate to the subject matter but relate to creation of laser images;
  - why the non-final Office Action does not contain key words “destruction”, “destroy” or their synonyms although 15 Claims from presented 19 Claims disclose methods for destruction of balloons by laser radiation.
3. The examiner tries to correct the nonsense of the absence of key words of the present invention in non-final Office Action by referencing to Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) which appears in only the Final Office Action. Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) does not relate to the subject matter of the present invention (destruction by using laser radiation) and the examiner makes this new reference only because Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) uses word “burst”, which is a synonym of the word “destruction” - the key word of the present application.
  4. This Office Action rejects present Claims without distinguishing one from another and without examining a Claim. All Claims are rejected together without their examination by using identical words: “Claims 1-2, 4-15 & 19 are rejected...” (page 2 (lines 3 and 8); page 3 (lines 1 and 11); page 4 (line 4); page 7 (line 3)).
  5. This Office Action rejects the present Claims only by describing the referenced patents without compare their methods with methods disclosed in the present Claims.
  6. This Final Office Action changes several base statements of the non-final Office Action without explaining the reasons of these modifications.
  7. The Final Office Action makes additional reference to Robbins (USPN 2,025,475)

which does not relate to the destruction of balloons by laser radiation at least because this patent was issued on 12-1935, when a laser has yet not been discovered.

8. This Office Action repeats the rejection of all presented Claims referencing to “a laser light show device, which uses the holography generating capability of laser light to produce projected images having enhanced holographic effects” (page 4) despite the statement of the applicants that the present invention does not use holographic method and even does not contain words “holography” or “holographic”. It is obvious, that the examiner did not read the applicant’s Respond.

9. This Office Action repeats the rejection of all Claims by referencing to that “red, blue and green laser may be used and in combination may provide a monochromatic coherent collimated laser beam” (pages 5-6) despite the statement of the applicants that a method of present invention does not use combination of red, blue and green lasers.

10. The Office Action rejects all claims, disclosing the destruction, by making reference to the following: “A perpendicular incident beam passes through the layers of the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index (i.e. at each surface of each transparent layer where there is a gas to transparent medium (e.g. glass to air) transition.” The invention does not use these operations and it is nonsense to reject claims by using the reference.

11. The Office Action rejects all Claims by referencing to the fact that “the modulated beam need not be of a visible light wavelength, since it is only necessary that secondary emissions from the imaging gas provide visible light” (page 5) although the present invention does not use the secondary emission effect and even does not contain words “secondary emission”,.

12. The Office Action rejects all Claims by referencing to the fact that “the laser beam is directed at a rotating viewing surface, the viewing of the surface being semi-

transparent...” (page 6) although the present invention does not use a “rotating viewing surface”.

**IV.** *The Office Action mailed on 02/09/2009 with respect to the application No. 11/317,379.*

This Office Action contains 4 lines without any examination of arguments stated in Responses to the Office Actions mailed on 09/05/2008 and 01/20/2009 with respect to application No. 11/317,379.

And so, all arguments of the applicants stated in the Responses to the Office Actions with respect to application No. 11/317,379 are completely ignored.

**V.** *The non-final Office Action mailed on 09/21/2007 with respect to the application No. 11/053,983*

1. The Detailed Action of this Office Action contains 3.5 pages from which 2 pages coincide with pages of Office Actions made with respect to applications No. 11/234,813 and 11/317,379.

2. The Office Action does not examine a claim of the present application.

3. The Office Action rejects Claims 1-11 & 14 without distinguishing one from another by making a reference to “a laser light show device, which uses the holography generating capability of laser light to produce projected image having enhanced holographic effects” (page 3). However, no claim comprises holographic method and the present application does not even contain words “holography” or “holographic”. Moreover the laser radiation used in the present invention cannot be used for holography.

4. The Office Action rejects all Claims 1-11 & 14 by referencing to that “red, blue and



green lasers may be used and in combination may provide a monochromatic coherent collimated laser beam” (pages 4). However, the present invention does not use combination of “red, blue and green lasers” and no one claim comprises words “red, blue and green”.

5. The Office Action rejects all Claims 1-11 & 14 by making a reference to the following: “A perpendicular incident beam passes through the layers of the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index (i.e. at each surface of each transparent layer where there is a gas to transparent medium (e.g. glass to air) transition” (page 3). However, the invention does not use “the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index” and the application does not even contain words “the transparent multi-planar optical element” and “refractive index”.

6. The Office Action rejects all Claims 1-11 & 14 by referencing to the fact that “the modulated beam need not be of a visible light wavelength, since it is only necessary that secondary emissions from the imaging gas provide visible light” (page 5). However, the present invention does not use the secondary emission effect and even does not contain words “secondary emission”.

7. The Office Action rejects all Claims 1-11 & 14 by referencing to the fact that “the shell is filled with an image gas (preferably an inert gas e.g. helium, neon, argon, xenon and so forth)” (page 4), although this invention does not use such “image gas” and none claim contains the words: “inert gas, helium, neon, argon, xenon and so forth”.

8. The Office Action rejects all Claims 1-11 & 14 by referencing to the fact that “the gaseous medium can be “biased” with an energy source (in a manner similar to the used in “pumped” laser), to reduce the amount of pulse (or packet) energy required to cause photon emission in the gaseous medium”. However, Claims 1-11 & 14 do not teach this operation and even do not contain words “photon emission”.

**VI.**    *The final Office Action mailed on 12/31/07 with respect to the application No. 11/053,983*

1. This Office Action contains pages which coincide word for word with pages of Office Actions mailed on 09/21/07; 09/03/08; 09/05/08; 12/29/08 with respect to applications No. 11/053,983; 11/234,813 and 317,379 and repeat word for word all incorrect statements of the non-final Office Action.

2. This Office Action does not examine even one claim of present application.

3. This Office Action does not explain the reason why Claims 1-11 & 14 are rejected by referencing to holography if the laser radiation, which uses in the present invention, cannot create holographic image and even word “holography” is not contained in the claims.

4. The Office Action does not also explain why all Claims 1-11 & 14 are rejected by referencing to the fact that “red, blue and green lasers may be used and in combination may provide a monochromatic coherent collimated laser beam” (pages 4) if the present invention does not use combination of “red, blue and green lasers” and no one claim comprises words “red, blue and green”.

5. The Office Action does not also explain why all Claims 1-11 & 14 are rejected by referencing to the fact that “a perpendicular incident beam passes through the layers of the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index (i.e. at each surface of each transparent layer where there is a gas to transparent medium (e.g. glass to air) transition”, if the invention does not use “the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index” and the application does not even contain words “the transparent multi-planar optical element” and “refractive index”.

6. The Office Action does not also explain why all Claims 1-11 & 14 are rejected by

referencing to the fact that “the modulated beam need not be of a visible light wavelength, since it is only necessary that secondary emissions from the imaging gas provide visible light”, if the present invention does not use the secondary emission effect and even does not contain words “secondary emission”.

7. The Office Action does not also explain why all Claims 1-11 & 14 are rejected by referencing to the fact that “the shell is filled with an image gas (preferably an inert gas e.g. helium, neon, argon, xenon and so forth)” (page 4), although this invention does not use such “image gas” and none claim of the present application contains the words: “inert gas, helium, neon, argon, xenon and so forth”.

**VII.** *The non-final Office Action mailed on 09/03/2008 with respect to the application No. 11/234,813*

1. This Office Action contains pages which coincide word for word with pages of Office Actions mailed on 09/05/2008 and 12/29/2008 with respect to application No. 11/317,379 and Office Actions mailed on 09/21/2007 and on 12/31/07 with respect to the application No. 11/053,983. The Detailed Action of this Office Action contains 6 pages from which 4 pages coincide with identical pages of Office Actions mailed on 09/05/2008 and 12/29/2008 with respect to application No. 11/317,379.

4. This Office Action does not contain the examination of even one present Claim.

5. This Office Action rejects all 20 Claims without distinguishing one from another even though some claims relate to the creation of laser fireworks (Claims 1- 12) while others (Claims 13 – 19) relate to the generation of laser-material interaction effects on special surfaces (“Claims 1-20 are rejected ...” page 2 lines 3; page3 lines 4, 11).

6. The present invention does not use holographic method and even does not contain words “holography” or “holographic”, but the examiner rejects Claims by referencing to

“a laser light show device, which uses the holography generating capability of laser light to produce projected images having enhanced holographic effects” (page 4).

7. A method of the present invention does not use combination of red, blue and green lasers (and even does not contains words “red, blue and green”) but this Office Action rejects Claims by referencing to the fact that “red, blue and green lasers may be used and in combination may provide a monochromatic coherent collimated laser beam” (pages 5-6)).

8. The examiner rejects claims by making reference to the following: “A perpendicular incident beam passes through the layers of the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index (i.e. at each surface of each transparent layer where there is a gas to transparent medium (e.g. glass to air) transition” (page 4). However, the invention does not use “the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index” and the application does not even contain words “the transparent multi-planar optical element” and “refractive index”.

9. The present invention does not use the secondary emission effect and even does not contain words “secondary emission” or “emission”, but the examiner rejects Claims by referencing to the fact that “the modulated beam need not be of a visible light wavelength, since it is only necessary that secondary emissions from the imaging gas provide visible light” (page 5).

10. The present invention does not use a “rotating viewing surface” and does not even contain such words, but the examiner rejects Claims by referencing to the fact that “the laser beam is directed at a rotating viewing surface, the viewing of the surface being semi-transparent...” (page 7).

**VIII.** *Office Action mailed on 11/27/2007 with respect to application No. 11/023,115.*

1. This application comprises only 9 Claims but no one Claim is examined.
2. The Detailed Action of this Office Action contains only 2 pages which include the paragraph "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102/103" coinciding word for word (only numbers of Claims are changed) with the same paragraph of the Office Action mailed on 08/21/2007.
3. 13 lines of the Detailed Action describe the referenced patents and the rest lines are generally accepted in any Office Action and are quotations of paragraphs of 35 USC §102/103 and §103(a)). No line is for examination of a present Claim.
4. This Office Action rejects all 9 Claims without distinguishing one from another ("Claims 19 - 27 are rejected ..." page 2, 3).
5. The present invention discloses a method for production of laser-inducer color images without using interferential effect but the Office Action rejects all presented claims by referencing to U.S. patent No. 6,596,967 wherein "resulting interference is selected to create a pixel with selected color when illuminated by multi-colored light". Moreover, a laser-induced damage in the present method is illuminated by corresponding monochromatic light.
6. The present invention works for any crystals and glass samples but the Office Action rejects all presented claims by referencing to U.S. patent No. 6,566,626 which works only for very specific transparent material known as "a light-sensitive glass sample". Moreover, after exposition, this light-sensitive glass sample should be heated to a very high temperature that causes color to appear. The present method does not demand this operation.

**IX.** *Office Action mailed on 02/16/2006 with respect to application No. 10/751,325.*

1. This application comprises only 10 Claims but no one Claim is examined.
2. The Detailed Action of this Office Action takes up less than 2 pages, the general part of which coincide (only numbers of Claims are changed) word for word with page 3 (from "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102) to page 4 of Office Action mailed on 06/30/2005.

3. 10 lines of the Detailed Action describe “Information Disclosure Statement”, 6 lines quote of paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rest lines describe the referenced patent. No line is for examination of a present Claim.
4. This Office Action rejects all 10 Claims without distinguishing one from another (“Claims 18 - 27 are rejected ...” page 2).
5. The subject matter of the present invention is the production of internal structure of 3D images but Office Action rejects all claims by referencing to patent, which does not teach how internal structure can be reproduced.
6. The examiner refused to give response to applicant’s arguments. The examiner states: “Applicant’s arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection”. This statement is lie statement because “the new ground(s) of rejection” is not presented in this Office Action. Paragraph “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102” of the Office Action mailed on 02/16/06 coincide word for word with the same paragraph of the Office Action mailed on 06/30/05 with respect to application No.10/751,325.

#### **EVIDANCE**

**that the Office Action in the response to the Request for Continued Examination does not contain examination of the applicant’s arguments stated in the Remarks of the Response and coincide word for word with the previous final Office Action.**

The Request for Continued Examination and the reexamination processing fees with respect to application No. 11/023,115 were mailed on 01/16/2008.

The Office Action mailed on 04/17/2008 is the Response to the Request.

1. This Office Action does not contain examination of arguments stated in the Request.
2. This Office Action mailed on 01/16/2008 coincides word for word with final Office Action mailed on 11/27/2007.
3. The paragraph “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102/103” of final Office

Action mailed on 11/27/2007 coincides word for word (only numbers of Claims are changed) with the same paragraph of the non- final Office Action mailed on 08/21/2007.

Thus, instead of paid-up Continued Examination, applicants received the Office Action (04/17/08) which coincides word for word with final Office Action (11/21/2007) the paragraph of which (“Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102/103”) coincides word for word (only numbers of Claims are changed) with the same paragraph of the non- final Office Action mailed on 08/21/2007.

### **EVIDANCE**

**that the Advisory Actions in the response to the Request for Reconsideration completely ignore the applicant’s arguments, contain false statement and misrepresent the facts.**

1. The Advisory Action mailed on 01/07/2008 in response to the Request for Reconsideration mailed on 12/11/2007 with respect to application No. 11/023,115 concludes: “All arguments set forth in the instant after final are well taken, however, the rejections of claims under the prior art is sustained for the reasons set forth in the final office action.”

The Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) contains: “Applicant argues that Miesak cannot reproduce the images”. However, this is false statement because the Remarks of the Request do not comprise the assertion. Really, applicants argue: “Miesak disclosing the method for creation of rainbow laser-induced images and cannot be used for reproduction of the color palette of producible images” (page 2, line 5-7).

The Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) contains: “Applicant argues that Gaissinsky required special glass samples”. It is half of the truth. The examiner (purposely) tries to hide the really situation. Indeed, the Remarks of the Request assert: “The method disclosed in USPN 6,566,626 to Gassinsky can be used only for “a light-sensitive glass sample” and cannot be used for customary glass samples or crystals. Whereas the present invention

6,768,080; 6,768,081; 6,946,619) and it is nonsense that the examiner who does not know these terms was be able to examine applications No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121 and 11/023,115, where laser-induced breakdown and a control of a breakdown threshold are the foundations of the present inventions.

2. The examiner uses incorrect term “threshold breakdown” instead of correct term “breakdown threshold” (page 2 Office Actions mailed on 09/05/2008 and on 12/29/2008 with respect to the application No. 11/317,379).
3. The examiner writes: “The claims are indefinite with respect to “internal crash” (page 3, line 7 of Office Action mailed on 08/21/2007 with respect to application No. 11/023,115). This term has been already used and explained in U.S. Patents (for example patents No.6,630,644 and 6,768,080)

#### **EVIDENCES FOR CONCLUSION**

**that the examiner, who produced Office Actions with respect to applications No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121; 11/129,730 and 11/023,115 does not know the breakdown phenomenon, which is the foundation of the inventions disclosed in the above mentioned applications.**

The examiner states in Office Actions mailed on 09/05/2008 and on 12/29/2008 with respect to the application No. 11/317,379, in Office Actions mailed on 09/21/2007 and on 12/31/07 with respect to the application No. 11/053,983 and in Office Action mailed on 09/03/2008 with respect to the application No. 11/234,813 that “Crabtree, IV does not disclose breakdown sparks but rather (“collide”) collision points, which will emit photons of visible light at the point of reinforcement. It is the examiner’s position that these collision points are the same as instant claims breakdown sparks.”

An electric bulb and a candle flame “emit photons of visible light” and therefore in accordance with the “examiner’s position” both bulb and a candle flame “are the same as instant claims breakdown sparks”. From one hand, it is right, but from another hand, breakdown sparks have very specific characteristics, which are a mystery for the



discloses the method which works for any transparent material without special physical-chemical properties”.

2. The Advisory Action mailed on 02/04/2008 in response to the Request for Reconsideration mailed on 01/08/2008 with respect to application No.11/053,983 contains the conclusion which is identical to Advisory Action mailed on 01/07/2008 in response to the Request for Reconsideration mailed on 12/11/2007 with respect to application No 11/023,115: “All arguments set forth in the instant after final are well taken, however, rejections of the claims under the prior art is sustained for the reasons set forth in the final office action.”

Indeed all arguments stated in Remarks of the Request for Reconsideration are completely ignored by examiner.

#### **EVIDENCES FOR CONCLUSION**

**that the examiner who produced Office Actions No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121 and 11/023,115 does not know the scientific publications, U.S. Patents and terminology relating to the art of the present invention and does not read presented references.**

1. Breakdown threshold describes basic characteristic of laser-induced breakdown, using of which lays the foundation of all presented inventions. However, the examiner doubts that term “breakdown threshold” is correct. Applicants, proving the correctness of the term, gave a reference to pages from “Handbook of Laser Material Processing, Laser Institute of America”. The examiner, answering to the reference, writes: “It is not clear if these pages are part of an IDS or an affidavit. This should be identified property in order to be given they full weight. An IDS is submitted on a 1449, while an affidavit (declaration) is submitted under 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132.” (The Office Action mailed on 12/29/2008 with respect to application No. 11/317,379, page 9).

Terms “breakdown threshold” and “laser-induced breakdown” are used in multiple U.S. Patents (for example, patents No: 6,399,914; 6,417,485; 6,426,480; 6,490,299; 6,509,548; 6,664,501; 6,670,576; 6,720,521; 6,720,523; 6,734,389; 6,740,846;

examiner, but which are the foundation for inventions presented in applications No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121; 11/129,730.

The basic characteristics of laser-induced breakdown and breakdown sparks used in applications No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121; 11/129,730 are the following:

- laser-induced breakdown and breakdown sparks are generated only at an area where laser energy increases breakdown threshold (it is nonsense, that the examiner doubts about correctness of terms “laser-induced breakdown” introduced by N. Bloembergen, Nobel Laureate for discovery of laser-induced breakdown, and “breakdown threshold” writing incorrect term “threshold breakdown” instead of “breakdown threshold” ;
- control of the breakdown sparks can be provided by controlling breakdown threshold;
- laser-induce breakdown and breakdown sparks are generated inside any transparent material and in contrast to “collide” points do not have preferable “an imaging gas ... (preferably an inert gas e.g. helium, neon, argon, xenon and etc) about which the examiner writes in Office Actions with respect to applications No. 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983;
- time difference between existence of laser-induced breakdown and the life of breakdown sparks;
- creation of breakdown sparks by very short pulse radiation about 10 nsec which cannot be used in holography although the examiner in Office Actions mailed on 09/05/2008; 12/29/2008; 09/21/2007; 12/31/2007 and 09/03/2008 constantly references to holography;
- loud sound which accompanies the breakdown spark generation;
- hot plasma which is created during laser-induced breakdown in result of which breakdown sparks can be used both for creating images and destruction of the inflated lightweight objects simultaneously;

- sound waves and hot plasma accompanying the generation of breakdown sparks provide special effects of laser interaction with inflated lightweight objects, which are used in the presented inventions.

Of course, “collide” points do not have the characteristics of the breakdown sparks mentioned above and cannot produce said effects, therefore “the examiner’s position that these collision points are the same as instant claims breakdown sparks” is an absurd position of a person, who knows nothing about laser-induced breakdown.

### **EVIDENCES FOR CONCLUSION**

**that the examiner, who produced Office Actions with respect to applications No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121; 11/129,730 and 11/023,115 does not know holography and the fundamental law of color creation.**

1. Applicant in the Remarks of the Response to Office Action mailed on 09/21/2007 with respect to application No. 11/053,983 states that “the present method does not use the holography effects whereas Crabtree’s method “uses the holography generating capability of laser light to produce projected images having enhanced holographic effects”.

The examiner answers in the Office Action mailed on 12/31/2007 with respect to application No. 11/053,983: “Applicant argues that Crabtree IV uses holographic effects while instant claims do not. The examiner respectfully notes that Crabtree IV discloses “a means for projecting a suspended holographic image. Further, a technique is provided for presenting three-dimensional volumetric images in a manner that hides the image generation apparatus from the user”. It is the examiner’s position that the suspended image of Crabtree IV is the same as the image of instant claims”.

So the examiner’s position is:

- 1) any suspended image is holographic image;

- 2) any technique which provides “presenting three-dimensional volumetric images in a manner that hides the image generation apparatus from the user” is holographic technique.

This examiner’s position is a position of a person, who does not know basic holographic principals: creation of an interference pattern, registration of this interference pattern and hologram reconstruction. Laser-induced images are suspended images but no one from mentioned above steps characterizing holography is used for creation of these images. Moreover, the radiation used for generation of the breakdown cannot be used for creation of needed interference pattern.

Although applicants gave the detailed explanation that laser-induced images are not holographic images, the examiner continues to reject all claims including claims disclosing destruction by making references to holography. (Office Actions mailed on 09/21/2007, page 3, lines 5 – 7; 12/31/2007, page 3, lines 7 – 9; 09/03/2008, page 4, lines 9 – 11; 09/05/2008, page 4, lines 10 – 12; 12/29/2008, page 4, lines 10 – 12).

2. The examiner states that “red, blue and green lasers may be used and in combination may provide a monochromatic collimated laser beam” (Office Actions mailed on 09/21/2007, page 4, lines 13 - 15; 12/31/2007, page 4, lines 13 – 15; 09/03/2008, page 5, lines 21, 22, page 6, line 1; 09/05/2008, page 5, lines 21, 22, page 6, line 1; 12/29/2008, page 5, lines 21,22, page 6, line 1).

The applicant explained in the Response that red, blue and green colors in combination are able to create in the human eyes sensation of any desirable color but it does not mean that “red, blue and green lasers may be used and in combination may provide a monochromatic collimated laser beam”. Any good student of a high school knows that combination of three deferent monochromatic oscillations cannot give a monochromatic oscillation therefore made examiner statement is not correct.

Despite this explanation, the examiner continued to reject the presented Claims by referencing the mentioned above examiner’s statement even when rejected claims do not relate to the color creation (Claims of applications No. 11/053,983; 11/234,813 and 11/317,379).

## **EVIDENCES FOR CONCLUSION**

**that the examiner, who produced Office Actions with respect to applications No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121; 11/129,730 and 11/023,115 makes lie statements.**

1. Examiner M. Alexandra Elve accuses inventors of lying in the Response mailed on 01/20/2009 to the final Office Action mailed on 12/29/2008.

The examiner writes: "Applicant states that the final office action is a word for word repeat of the previous office action. The examiner respectfully disagrees because a new reference Robbins is presented in the final office action and discussed at length."

However, the Response states the following: "The Final Office Action does not contain the examination of the ground arguments stated in the Response mailed on 09.18.2008. This Final Office Action uses previously prepared and frequently used text, which does not relate to the subject matter. Detailed Action of the Final Office Action contains 6 ½ pages, from which 4 ½ pages coincide word for word (with the exception of 10 lines) with identical pages of the Office Actions made with respect to the applications No.11/234,813; 11/053,983 and 11/023,115, although methods disclosed in these applications and the method of the present application relate to different subject matters" (page 2).

Concerning "a new reference Robbins," the response states: "The examiner tries to correct the nonsense, mentioned in item 5, by making additional reference to Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) which appears in the Final Office Action. Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) does not relate to the subject matter of the present invention and the examiner makes this new reference only because Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) uses word "burst", which is a synonym of the word "destruction" - the key word of the present application" (page 5).

2. Examiner M. Alexandra Elve accuses inventors of lying in the Advisory Action mailed on 01/07/2008 in response to the Request for Reconsideration mailed on 12/11/2007 with respect to application No. 11/023,115.

The examiner writes: "Applicant argues that Miesak cannot reproduce the images".

This is false statement because the Remarks of the Request do not comprise the assertion. Really, applicants argue: "Miesak disclosing the method for creation of rainbow laser-induced images and cannot be used for reproduction of the color palette of producible images" (page 2, line 5-7).

This lie is used by the examiner for rejection of all claims of the present invention.

3. The examiner accuses inventors in the Office Actions mailed on 09/05/08 with respect to application No.11/317,379 that they use incorrect terms: "threshold breakdown" and "laser induced breakdown". Applicants answer in the Response mailed on 09/18/2008 that the present application does not contain these terms. However, the next Office Action mailed on 12/29/08 repeats the same accusation.

4. The examiner states in the Office Action mailed on 09/21/2007 with respect to application No.11/053,983 (page 2) that term "breakdown sparks" is incorrect. However, the examiner use the term (like correct term) in next Office Actions, mailed on 12/31/07 (page 5, lines 1 – 2); 09/03/2008 (page 6, lines 8 – 9); 09/05/2008 (page 6, lines 8 – 9) and 12/29/2008 (page 6, lines 8 – 9).

5. The examiner states in the Office Action mailed on 02/16/06 with respect to the application No.10/751,325: "Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection". This statement is false because no "the new ground(s) of rejection" is (are) not presented. Paragraph "Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102" of the Office Action mailed on 02/16/06 coincide word for word with the same paragraph of the Office action mailed on 06/30/05 with respect to application No.10/751,325.